Case: 09-60840 Document: 00511407520 Page: 1 Date Filed: 03/11/2011

## IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT United States Court

United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

**FILED** March 11, 2011

No. 09-60840 Summary Calendar

Lyle W. Cayce Clerk

CLIVE FERNANDO WILSON,

Petitioner

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., U. S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent

Petitions for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals BIA No. A034 090 212

Before KING, DeMOSS, and DENNIS, Circuit Judges.
PER CURIAM:\*

Clive Fernando Wilson, a native and citizen of Jamaica, seeks a petition for review of the order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) denying his motion to reconsider its approval of the immigration judge's (IJ) final order of deportation. Wilson raises numerous issues and generally asserts that his deportation proceedings violated his due process rights.

We generally review only the BIA's decision except to the extent that the IJ's decision influences the BIA. *Zhu v. Gonzales*, 493 F.3d 588, 593 (5th Cir.

 $<sup>^{*}</sup>$  Pursuant to 5th Cir. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5th Cir. R. 47.5.4.

Case: 09-60840 Document: 00511407520 Page: 2 Date Filed: 03/11/2011

No. 09-60840

2007). We lack jurisdiction to review the denial of Wilson's requests for relief because he is removable for having committed the aggravated felony of conspiracy to possess cocaine with the intent to distribute. See 8 U.S.C. §§ 1252(a)(2)(C), 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)(II), 1251(a)(2)(A)(iii), 1101(a)(43)(B); 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)(2); Lopez v. Gonzales, 549 U.S. 47, 60 (2006); Balogun v. Ashcroft, 270 F.3d 274, 277-78 & n.10 (5th Cir. 2001).

Although we are not precluded from reviewing claims raising constitutional or purely legal questions, see § 1252(a)(2)(D), Wilson's assertions of alleged due process violations are merely abuse of discretion claims in disguise. See Assaad v. Ashcroft, 378 F.3d 471, 475 (5th Cir. 2004) ("[T]he failure to receive relief that is purely discretionary in nature does not amount to a deprivation of a liberty interest.") (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). Accordingly, Wilson's petition for review is DISMISSED FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION.